

III. REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed January 16, 2008, the period in which to respond has been extended to an including July 16, 2008, August 7, 2007, wherein: (1) the submission of the International Search Report was objected to; (2) the drawings were objected to; (3) Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,580,863 (YEGNANARAYANAN et al.); (4) Claims 4, 7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over YEGNANARAYANAN et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,944,838 (KOCH); and (5) Claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over YEGNANARAYANAN et al.

By the present amendment: Applicants have submitted a Form PTO-1449 for the Examiner to complete and correct his inadvertent error in objecting to the International Search Report; (2) submitted formal drawings; and , amended the Claims to patentably define over the prior art made of record. Reconsideration of this application and entry of thsi amendment are respectfully requested.

Addressing first the issue with the Information Disclosure Statement, a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 was issued by the Office indicating that a copy of the International Search Report had been received by the Office on July 2007. In accordance with MPEP § 609.03, the Examiner was obligated to indicate to applicants via Form Paragraph 6.53 that he had considered the art cited in the International Search Report, including at a minimum the U.S. Patents and Patent Publications cited therein, notwithstanding the fact that such copies may not have been received by the Office.

There is no indication in the Office Action that indicates that the Examiner has complied with his obligation under MPEP §609.03. Accordingly, applicants hereby submit a completed form PTO-1449 to ensure that all the materials cited in the International Search Report have been considered by the Office in the examination of this application.

A new set fo formal drawings has been submitted by applicants to overcome the drawing objections raise dint he Office action.

The claims have been amended to patentably define over the art made of record by the Examiner.

The independent claims have been amended to recite that the steps are formed on the structure by “dry etching” and support for these amendments are found in the specification at Paragraphs 0025, 0026, 0030 and 0032. Dry etching achieves smoother finishes than one

would obtain utilizing the teachings of the YEGNANARAYANAN et al. and KOCH references. With smoother finishes, comes better optical coupling

Applicants look forward to an indication of the allowance of all of the claims of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: July 16, 2008

By: Thomas D. Paulius
Thomas D. Paulius
Registration No. 30,792

2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4897
Fax.: (630) 416-4962